



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/072,714	02/05/2002	Haim Ben-Ari	UTL 00123	1951
7590	10/24/2006		EXAMINER KIM, WESLEY LEO	
Kyocera Wireless Corp. Attn: Patent Department P.O. Box 928289 San Diego, CA 92192-8289			ART UNIT 2617	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 10/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/072,714	BEN-ARI, HAIM	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Wesley L. Kim	2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 September 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,3,6-8,10-12 and 17-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,3,6-8,10-12 and 17-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 9/5/06 has been entered.

Response to Amendment

This Office Action is in response to Amendments filed on 9/5/06.

- Claims 1 and 12 are currently amended.
- Claims 2, 4-5, 9, 13-16 are cancelled.
- Claims 1, 3, 6-8, 10-12, and 17-28 are pending in the current Office Action.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3, 6-8, 10-12, and 17-28 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

1. Claims 1 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ghaem et al (U.S. Patent 5146231).

Regarding Claim 1, Ghaem teaches a communications device including a display screen (Fig.1;20), the display screen defining a screen axis (Col.3;43-48), and a reference axis (Fig.1;21), a method for displaying direction comprising:

determining a relationship between a magnetic bearing and the reference axis (Col.6;41-48, angle A);

aligning the reference axis with the screen axis (Col.4;10-24, the device can be rotated by the user such that the reference axis is aligned with the screen axis);

Displaying the reference axis on the display screen (Fig.1;21);

Determining a direction the screen axis is pointing based on the relation between the reference axis and the magnetic bearing (Col.6;41-48); and

Displaying the direction associated with the screen axis on the display screen (Col.5;12-14).

Regarding Claim 11, determining the magnetic bearing of the wireless communications device includes correcting the magnetic bearing with respect to true north (Col.3;30-33).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 2617

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ghaem et al (U.S. Patent 5146231) in view of Amro et al (U.S. Patent 6292747 B1).

Regarding Claim 12, Ghaem teaches a user interface screen having a surface with a screen axis defined with respect to the surface (Col.3;43-48); a magnetic detection circuit configured to determine magnetic bearing; and a direction circuit configured to (Col.6;41-48, bearing of the device must obviously be determined to determine the orientation):

determine a relationship between the magnetic bearing and a reference axis (Col.6;41-48, angle A),

determine a direction of the reference axis based on the relationship between the magnetic bearing and the reference axis (Col.5;12-14); and wherein the user interface screen displays the direction of the reference axis (Col.5;12-14), however Ghaem **does not expressly teach** aligning the reference axis with the screen axis so that the reference axis always points in the same direction as the screen axis.

Amro teaches that there is an arrow adjacent to the vehicle which points in the direction of travel of the vehicle, and the display screen is oriented such that the vehicle is always moving towards the top edge of the display (Col.4;20-26, it is obvious that the map rotates such that the display screen is oriented such that the vehicle is always moving towards the top edge of the display). Ghaem teaches that a screen axis is not even really necessary because of the rectangular shape of the housing but teaches that a screen axis can be notched or printed onto the housing

Art Unit: 2617

(Col.3:43-49). To the examiner, it is obvious that Ghaem teaches that it is well known in the art that a screen axis can be notched or printed on the screen of a navigation device and with Amro, it is obvious that the reference axis (the arrow) will always be aligned with the screen axis that can be drawn on the the surface of the screen.

To one of ordinary skill in the art, it would have been obvious to modify Ghaem with Amaro, such that the reference axis is aligned with the screen axis so that the reference axis always points in the same direction as the screen axis, to provide a method where the user can see the direction that they are heading in with respect to the map.

3. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ghaem et al (U.S. Patent 5146231) in view of Farine (U.S. Patent 6185157 B1).

Regarding Claim 3, Ghaem teaches all the limitations as recited in claim 1, however Ghaem **does not expressly teach** that the reference axis points to magnetic north.

Farine teaches that it is well known in the art to use a reference axis which points to magnetic north to determine a target destination from a source location (Col.1:1-17).

To one of ordinary skill in the art, it would have been obvious to modify Ghaem with Farine, since they are dealing with providing directional information with respect to their current location, such that the reference axis points to magnetic

north, to provide a reference point when a person is navigating unknown terrain so as to avoid getting lost.

4. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ghaem et al (U.S. Patent 5146231) in view of Maruyama et al (U.S. Patent 6430498 B1).

Regarding Claim 6, Ghaem teaches all the limitations as recited in claim 1, and Ghaem further teaches receiving GPS location information (Abstract;6-9), however Ghaem **does not expressly teach**, receiving map information; and displaying a map display responsive to the map information, showing the wireless communications device location on the map.

Maruyama teaches receiving map information (Col.1;32-37, it is known map information can be received/downloaded) and, displaying a map display responsive to the map information (Col.1;35-37, it is possible to show the users present place on a map which was received), showing the wireless communications device location on the map (Col.1;35-37 and Col.6;57-61, the black dot represents the location of the wireless device).

To one of ordinary skill in the art, it would have been obvious to modify Maruyama with Ghaem, since they are from similar search areas, viz. presenting a direction based on the current location in a mobile electronic device, such that map information is received; and a map display responsive to the map information is displayed, and showing the wireless communications device location on the map, to provide a method of displaying to the user an image of the surroundings so that they may navigate the region towards a destination.

5. Claims 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ghaem et al (U.S. Patent 5146231) in view of Maruyama et al (U.S. Patent 6430498 B1) in further view of Johnson (U.S. Patent 6366856 B1).

Regarding Claim 7, Ghaem and Maruyama teach all the limitations as recited in claim 6, and Ghaem further teaches of a screen axis 18 (Col.3:43-49), however the combination does not expressly teach, rotating the map display in response to the rotation of the screen axis.

Johnson teaches rotating a map display in response to the rotation of the mobile phone (i.e. rectangular phone) (Fig.2A-D, map rotates as user turns).

To one of ordinary skill in the art, it would have been obvious to modify, Ghaem and Maruyama with Johnson since they are from similar search areas, viz. presenting a map based on the current location in a mobile electronic device, such that the map displayed is rotated in response to the rotation of the screen axis, to provide a method of orienting the map in such a way that what is directly in front of the user will be on the top of the display, thus a more intimate interactive relationship is improved and the map more readily beneficial to the user.

Regarding Claim 8, Maruyama further teaches the direction displayed corresponds with the direction the wireless communication device is moving (Fig.1;12, Fig.1;13, and Fig.1;14, the direction displayed corresponds with the direction the wireless communication device is moving).

Art Unit: 2617

6. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ghaem et al (U.S. Patent 5146231), Maruyama et al (U.S. Patent 6430498 B1), and Johnson (U.S. Patent 6366856 B1) in further view of Irie et al (U.S. Pub 2001/0007090 A1).

Regarding Claim 10, Ghaem, Maruyam, and Johnson teach all the limitations as recited in claim 8, however the combination **does not expressly teach** displaying a magnetic bearing icon on the map.

Irie teaches displaying a magnetic bearing mark (i.e. icon) of the screen axis (Fig.7;212 and Par.81,7-8, bearing mark of the map 212). To the examiner it is obvious that the vehicle is traveling north, therefore the bearing mark displays an icon pointing North (Fig.7;212). If the car were to turn (i.e. map rotates) the map would reorient itself such that the top of the display shows what is directly in front of the vehicle and so the bearing mark icon would adjust to display a bearing representative of the screen axis. Although Irie deals with displaying maps for navigation in a vehicle, it is obvious for a skilled artisan to apply the navigational aspects of Irie (i.e. navigation system is mobile) into another navigational electronic device (i.e. mobile communications device).

To one of ordinary skill in the art, it would have been obvious to modify, Ghaem, Maruyama, and Johnson with Irie, such that the magnetic bearing of the screen axis is displayed, to provide the user with an idea of which direction they are moving with respect to the reference axis.

7. Claims 17-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ghaem et al (U.S. Patent 5146231) and Amro et al (U.S. Patent 6292747 B1) in further view of Maruyama et al (U.S., Patent 6430498 B1).

Regarding Claim 17, Ghaem and Amro teaches all the limitations are cited in claim 12, however the combination **does not expressly teach**, receiving map information; and displaying a map display responsive to the map information, showing the wireless communications device location on the map.

Maruyama teaches receiving map information (Col.1;32-37, it is known map information can be received/downloaded) and, displaying a map display responsive to the map information (Col.1;35-37, it is possible to show the users present place on a map which was received), showing the wireless communications device location on the map (Col.1;35-37 and Col.6;57-61, the black dot represents the location of the wireless device).

To one of ordinary skill in the art, it would have been obvious to modify Maruyama and Amro with Ghaem, since they are from similar search areas, viz. presenting a direction based on the current location in a mobile electronic device, such that map information is received; and a map display responsive to the map information is displayed, and showing the wireless communications device location on the map, to provide a method of displaying to the user an image of the surroundings so that they may navigate the region towards a destination.

Regarding Claim 18, See Rejection of Claim 7.

Regarding Claim 19, See Rejection of Claim 8.

Regarding Claim 20, See Claim 6 rejection.

Regarding Claim 21, Amro teaches the arrow (Col.4;20-26) on the display is a directional icon on the map.

Regarding Claim 22, See rejection of Claim 11.

Regarding Claim 23, See rejection of Claim 8.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wesley L. Kim whose telephone number is 571-272-7867. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:00am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, George Eng can be reached on 571-272-7495. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

WLK

Worley fm

George Eng.
GEORGE ENG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER